

C.I.A. Inquiry Hailed; Recommendations Called Weak

By SEYMOUR M. HERSH
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 11—The official who provided much of the basic information for the initial account in The New York Times of domestic spying last December praised the Rockefeller commission today for compiling what he termed an "exhaustive" report on the Central Intelligence Agency's illegal activities.

But the source, who spoke only under the continued guarantee of anonymity, criticized the commission's recommendations as being too weak and not providing for explicit statutory prohibition—with appropriate punishment—for future wrongdoing.

The official, who has had direct access to highly classified intelligence information, estimated that 90 per cent or more of the allegations he knew about had been described in the commission's report. "I was kind of shocked by the details," he said. "I didn't think the commission would turn out that much detail."

Spying on Congressmen

One conspicuous omission, he said, dealt with the C.I.A.'s domestic spying on members of Congress. The Rockefeller commission report made no mention of such files, although William E. Colby, Director of Central Intelligence, told a House subcommittee last March 5 that files on at least four present and former members of Congress were maintained by the C.I.A.'s special domestic counterintelligence unit.

One such file showed that the agency had maintained a dossier on Representative Bella S. Abzug, Democrat of Manhattan, since 1953—17 years before she was elected to Congress—and had illegally opened some of her mail.

Mr. Colby further testified that "a number" of the domestic counterintelligence files had been destroyed, an assertion that also was omitted from the Rockefeller commission's report.

Other sources with some independent knowledge of the domestic spying activities subsequently noted in telephone interviews that the commission's report did not mention the destruction in late 1974 of between 150 and 200 C.I.A. domestic files on black dissidents, nearly all of which included photographs of some kind.

No Cover-up Seen

Sources close to the Rockefeller

commission said that, despite repeated checks, they had been unable to find any documentary evidence of such undercover C.I.A. activities in New York City. The former C.I.A. agent identified himself as having worked for the agency's domestic operations divisions there.

"We found everything that was humanly possible on that operation," he added.

In effect, agreeing with that statement, The Times's basic intelligence source predicted that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, whose chairman is Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, would be unable to significantly advance the commission's findings—at least in the area of illegal domestic activities. "They're nice enough people," he said of the staff members of the Senate committee, "but not substantial enough to handle this."

Intensive Interviewing

any further information about domestic spying, the source said, would have to result from intensive personal interviewing of C.I.A. domestic operatives who may not have officially reported all of their activities.

The Times's source attacked the 30 recommendations by the Rockefeller commission as being totally inadequate.

"There are too many recommendations that say that the C.I.A., the President and the director [for the C.I.A.] 'should not' do things without imposing criminal sanctions," he said.

"We need criminal sanctions to hold the bureaucracy in line," the source continued. "Times have a way of chang-

ing, and world views change. Without criminal sanctions, it's possible that conditions could arise which would involve activities like those now being criticized. Don't forget, justifications change with the times."

End to Further Inquiries

The source concluded the interview with what amounted to a plea for an end to further inquiries. "It's time to return to normal for the C.I.A.," he said. "This has been upsetting even more so for the analytical types than the covert types [in the agency]."

He added that many C.I.A. analysts, those who research data and prepare intelligence estimates, "were deeply disappointed to find out that their agency, which they have respected for, was involved in this kind of a thing."

The Rockefeller commission report also did not deal with the allegations, as published by The New York Times last Dec. 29, of a former C.I.A. domestic operative who said he had conducted break-ins, wiretap operations and other illegal activities while investigating antiwar groups in New York City in the late nineteen-sixties and early nineteen-seventies.

In Congressional testimony last February, Mr. Colby said the agency had been unable to identify the former C.I.A. man, who was not identified

by name in The Times's account, and added: "I fear that the journalist has been the victim of what we in the intelligence trade call a fabricator."

No Evidence Found

Sources close to the Rockefeller commission said that, despite repeated checks, they had been unable to find any documentary evidence of such undercover C.I.A. activities in New York City. The former C.I.A. agent identified himself as having worked for the agency's domestic operations divisions there.

In a telephone interview this morning, the former C.I.A. operative—who depicted New York City as "a big training ground" for undercover agents—expressed skepticism that a full account of all the C.I.A.'s domestic activities would ever be compiled.

"It's so easy to cover up," he said. "You're never going to find out what really happened; all the details and all the people involved will never come out."

"They'll clean up their shop a little, but in 10 or 20 years it'll start again," he added. "It's all so cyclical."

The former C.I.A. man has refused thus far to agree to discuss his activities with members of the Rockefeller commission or the Senate committee headed by Mr. Church.

**COOL, GREEN, CAMP, KIDS.
AID THE FRESH AIR FUND**

feller commission conceded that such information had not been included in the final report, but emphasized—as one put it—that there was no evidence that this was an attempt to hide anything. "A lot of files on blacks were not destroyed," one source said.

"It would be a mistake," another source said, "to put